

**REMARKS**

Claims 14 has been canceled. Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-13, 16-18, 20-21, and 23-25, and amended claims 1, 6, 11, 15, 19, and 22 are in this application.

Claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0159544 A1 (Karaoguz) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0044436 A1 (Watanabe) and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0114204 A1 (Allen et al.).

Each of independent claims 1, 6, 11, 15, 19, and 22 has been amended herein. As a result and as an example, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

**"reception slot setting means for setting at least one reception slot for receiving a signal in said predetermined frame period which avoids a reception slot or slots of the other wireless communication apparatus." (Emphasis added.)**

It is submitted that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1 (and to claims 6, 11, 15, 19, and 22). With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to lines 7-11 of page 17 and lines 9-12 of page 28 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Karaoguz, Watanabe and Allen applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose the above-identified feature as now specifically recited in claim 1. That is, in explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner appears to assert that paragraph 0063 of Karaoguz discloses the reception slot setting means of claim 1. In response, it is submitted that although such portion of Karaoguz appears to

mention a guaranteed time slot (GTS) period in which communicating devices may transmit data frames, such portion of Karaoguz does not appear to disclose the reception slot setting means as now recited in claim 1. That is, such portion of Karaoguz does not appear to disclose "setting at least one reception slot for receiving a signal in said predetermined frame period which avoids a reception slot or slots of the other wireless communication apparatus."

More specifically, the portion of Karaoguz relied on by the Examiner appears to pertain to slots used for transmitting data and not for receiving data. In section 3 on page 2 of the present Office Action the Examiner appears to acknowledge this difference; however, the Examiner appears to assert that such section of Karaoguz "implies" setting slots for receiving. In response, it is submitted that setting slots for transmitting data is not the same as setting a slot or slots for receiving data. Additionally, it is also submitted that setting slots for transmitting data is not the same as setting receiving slots (for receiving a signal or data) which avoids a reception slot or slots of the other wireless communication apparatus, as now recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the combination of Karaoguz, Watanabe and Allen applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons described above.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 6, 11, 15, 19, and 22 are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Karaoguz, Watanabe and Allen.

Claims 2-5, 9-10, 12-13 and 16-18, 20-21, and 23-25 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims.

Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-5, 9-10, 12-13 and 16-18, 20-21, and 23-25 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Karaoguz, Watanabe and Allen for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaoguz in view of Watanabe further in view of Allen et al., and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Claims 7-8 are dependent from amended independent claim 6. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 7-8 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Karaoguz, Watanabe and Allen for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on "well know prior art" to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Karaoguz. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 7-8 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Karaoguz, Watanabe, Allen and "well know prior art".

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/506,461

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-1048

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Dennis M.  
Smid, Esq./

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant